

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,058	09/11/2003	Craig Heacock	CP245	7280
27573 CEPHALON,	7590 12/18/2006 INC.		EXAMINER	
41 MOORES ROAD		•	KIM, JENNIFER M	
PO BOX 4011 FRAZER, PA	9355 ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER	
,			1617	
SHORTENED STATUTO	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	Y MODE
31 DAYS		12/18/2006	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/660,058	HEACOCK ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer Kim	1617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING [- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAL AND A STATE OF THIS COMMUNICAL AND A S	ATION. ly be timely filed IS from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11:	September 2003.		
	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allows		s, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under	•		
Disposition of Claims	•		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-44</u> is/are pending in the application	n.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) 1-44 are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.		
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ ac	cepted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ction is required if the drawing(s	is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached (Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)□ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:		•	
 Certified copies of the priority documer 	nts have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documen	nts have been received in App	olication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price		eceived in this National Stage	
application from the International Burea	` ''		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	t of the certified copies not re	ceived.	
Attachment(s)		•	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sur		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		Mail Date rmal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-10, 18 and 20-44, drawn to a pharmaceutical unit dose consisting essentially of about 250 to about 450mg of modafinil, classified in class 514, subclass 618.
- II. Claims 11-17 and 19, drawn to a method of treating ADHD in a human subject comprising the step of administering a single dose of about 250 to about 450mg of modafinil within a 24 hour period to the human subject, classified in class 514, subclass 618.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Group I and Group II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product because the product has been used to treat urinary and/or fecal incontinence.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their

Application/Control Number: 10/660,058

Art Unit: 1617

recognized divergent subject matter the searches are not coextensive, particularly, required non-patent literature search involving different biological mechanism.

Therefore, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicants are advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicants traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicants are reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Application/Control Number: 10/660,058

Art Unit: 1617

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claims will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claims will not be rejoined. See MPEP 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-0628. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 6:30 am to 3 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax

Art Unit: 1617

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jennifer Kim Patent Examiner Art Unit 1617

Jmk November 27, 2006